



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,208	06/26/2003	Barton D. Gaskins	067949-5025	4366
9629	7590	11/04/2008		
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			EXAMINER	
			YANG, ANDREW	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3775				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/606,208	Applicant(s) GASKINS ET AL.
	Examiner ANDREW YANG	Art Unit 3775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 94-102, 106, 107 and 111-123 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 94-97 and 111 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 98-102, 106, 107 and 112-123 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicants amendment filed on 6/30/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 98-102, 106, 107, and 112-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 98, line 8, "the lengthwise grain" and "the clamped substrate" lack a positive prior antecedent. The terms are only previously functionally recited and then positively recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 98-102, 106, 107, 112, 113, and 118-121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stayton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3856219) in view of Meredith (U.S. Patent No. 6755365).

Stayton et al. discloses a substrate cutting device 10 having a cutter 18 a clamping mechanism 16 and a slide mechanism 30 coupled to the cutter 18. The slide mechanism 30 reciprocates parallel to base 10 (column 2, lines 6-10) and perpendicular to the clamp mechanism 16 and is thus considered capable of sliding parallel to the length wise grain of the substrate depending on the orientation of the substrate when placed into the bone supply channel 14. The slide mechanism 30 is pneumatically operated (column 1, lines 56-60). It is considered that it is obvious to have a sensor/gauge with the pneumatic device since pressure in such devices needs to be regulated. The clamp is manually actuated. A controller, such as the operator controls both the clamp and the slide mechanism and it is considered that the controller is capable of varying the speed of the cutter and the force of the clamp. The blade section 28 of the cutter has teeth (Figure 4). In use a cadaver bone is placed into bone channel 14 and clamped with clamp mechanism 16 (column 1, lines 45-46). Cadaver bone is considered to be implant bone derived from a human source. Slayton et al. fails to

disclose the second clamping mechanism controlled by a pneumatic actuator. Meredith teaches a bone mill device 10 having a cutting element 17 located at a distal end of a bone chute 60. The guide 60 has a clamping mechanism 66 with a contacting plate 68. The clamp mechanism is pneumatically powered to deliver the bone 22 at a consistent pressure and speed (column 6, lines 49-54). Consistent speed and pressure leads to little or no heat produced during the cutting process which allows for the preservation of morphogenetic proteins, allowing the bone to retain its osteoinductivity (column 6, lines 40-46). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Stayton et al. with the clamping mechanism actuated by a pneumatic means in view of Meredith in order to provide consistent pressure and speed to the bone so as to eliminate heat and preserve the osteoinductivity of the bone.

With regard to claim 106, With regard to claims 2 and 3, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Stayton et al. as modified by Meredith with the clamp actuation unit to apply a force of 150-250 lbs, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

With regard to claim 107, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Stayton et al. as modified by Meredith with the clamp actuation unit to apply a force of 200 lbs, since it

has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 114, 116, 117, 122, and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stayton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3856219) in view of Meredith (U.S. Patent No. 6755365) and further in view of Morris et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2006/0024656).

Stayton et al. and Meredith disclose the claimed method except for plasticizing, freezing, or, combing the substrate with glycerol prior to cutting. Morris et al. teaches a method of making bone particles where the bone is frozen (Paragraph 47), plasticized (Paragraph 50), and combined with glycerol prior to cutting (Paragraph 49). These steps result in a greater yield of particles for the available bone compared with that provided by previous methods (Paragraph 9). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to freeze, plasticize, or combing with glycerol prior to cutting the substrate of Stayton et al. as modified by Meredith in view of Morris et al. to provide a greater yield of particles from the available bone than compared to previous methods.

Claim 115 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stayton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3856219) in view of Meredith (U.S. Patent No. 6755365) and further in view Schmitz (U.S. Patent No. 4637931).

Stayton et al. and Meredith disclose the claimed invention except for freeze drying the substrate. Schmitz teaches that freeze drying cortical bone has been shown to elicit little or no cell-mediated response and is the least antigenic of other bone

allografts (column 3, lines 31-37). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to freeze dry the substrate of Stayton et al. and Meredith in view of Schmitz in order to produce an allograft that is antigenic.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 98-102, 106, and 107 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW YANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3472. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on 571-272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 3775

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Yang/

Examiner, Art Unit 3775

10/29/2008

/Eduardo C. Robert/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733